

**County of Loudoun
Department of Planning**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 20, 2007

TO: The Loudoun County Planning Commission

FROM: John Merrithew, Project Manager

SUBJECT: ZMAP 2006-0016, Kincora

Following the May 21, 2007 public hearing, the Planning Commission forwarded Kincora to committee to review issues raised at the hearing. Most speakers at the hearing were in favor of the application because of the opportunity it brings for affordable housing and the benefits of mixed use development. Those opposed to the application referred to increased school costs, flaws in the project design and questioned the viability of additional "town center" projects in the Route 7 corridor. An adjacent property owner, Mehdi Pahlavani, was opposed to the proposed alignment of Russell Branch Parkway which according to the Countywide Transportation Plan runs through his newly renovated home. The issues identified by staff at the hearing are summarized here along with staff's position.

The Planning Commission had several questions, which are also outlined in this memo. New information was received from the applicant and attached to the memo without staff review. Some of the information, the fiscal analysis and CDA petition had been submitted to staff previously. The revised proffers, response to Zoning comments and alternative road alignment for the Pahlavani property has not been reviewed by staff.

Outstanding Issues

1. The proposed residential uses are not permitted in Keynote Employment areas.
2. The subject site is located within the Route 28 Tax District, where residential development is not permitted. Any residential development directly reduces the viability of the Route 28 Tax District to fund major roadway improvements and may deter employment development on surrounding sites.

Staff recommends the residential component be removed. If the Commission and Board choose to consider the residential development, staff recommends the proffered development phasing schedule be modified to postpone residential development until Phase 3. This would establish the project as an employment center as envisioned by the County and COG.

The applicant has proposed 700 (50%) residential units in phase 1, linked to construction of 700,000 square feet of non-residential space including no more than 150,000 square feet of retail space. Phase 2 would permit up to 1,000 residential units provided 1,000,000 square feet of non-residential space including a maximum of 300,000 square feet of retail space. The final phase, starting after construction of 1,000,000 square feet of non-residential space would have no linkage between residential and non-residential space.

Note that the term non-residential space can include the hotels and civic uses.

3. The application does not ensure employment uses will develop to the intensity envisioned for Keynote Employment areas or to the intensity already permitted by current zoning.

The applicant has proffered that in the first two development phases, some of the office space will be located in 4-story buildings containing 100,000 square feet each. In Phase 1, 225,000 square feet of office space will be in buildings at least four stories high. In Phase 2 puts an additional 175,000 square feet of office in four story building. Staff believes the proffer is inadequate and should provide that all land bays fronting on Pacific Boulevard be retained for buildings that are at least four stories high.

4. Project lacks an appropriate schedule for road improvements and does not propose improvements where they are needed outside the applicant's property.

This is an issue only if the Board of Supervisors chooses not to approve a community development authority (CDA) to fund road improvements. If the applicant resorts to the proffering the improvements as currently proposed, the Gloucester Parkway is deferred to very late in the project. Staff is recommending that the Gloucester Parkway connection to Loudoun County Parkway be completed prior to residential development being constructed since Gloucester Parkway will be the safest and most efficient travel route for school buses and for residents to get to other amenities and services.

5. The application does not comply with the Zoning Ordinance. Proposed modifications do not exceed the public purpose of the Ordinance standards.

This issue is still under review. The applicant's response to staff comments are still under review.

6. The application at this time fails to mitigate capital facilities impacts.

The applicant has not yet provided an estimate of the value of their capital facilities proffers. The project includes a land dedication for fire and rescue site, dedication of floodplain/passive park, and recreational trails. The extent to which these will be credited to capital facilities impacts has not been evaluated. County guidelines recommend a capital facilities proffer of approximately \$22.7 million

7. The project design impacts sensitive environmental areas, particularly steep slopes and drainageways.

Staff is recommending the application avoid impact to steep slopes and floodplains by relocating streets and other encroaching features. The applicant has agreed to a number of changes addressing this issue.

8. The application does not adequately commit to a wetlands mitigation bank, tree preservation or storm water management features that will address concerns regarding water quality and habitat protection.
9. The application proposes to establish design guidelines rather than specify on the concept development plan the design details of the project.

Staff recommends the applicant clarify their intent regarding items 8 and 9 and proffer an opportunity for the County to evaluate and approve the design guidelines.

Commission Comments/Questions

Offer a practical solution to review without CDA.

County staff and the applicant both agree the early completion of the major roads is critical. To do this the applicant will be asking the Board of Supervisors to approve a Community Development Authority (CDA) financing proposal that will allow the sale of bonds based on the value of the project to fund road improvements within three years of CDA approval.

If the community development authority financing is approved by the Board, timing is not an issue. If the improvements must be completed through a proffer, then the schedule currently proposed by the applicant is inadequate. The application traffic analysis divided the project into three phases. Phase 1 is expected to generate 24,000 trips per day, Phase 2, 45,000 trips, and at build out, the project will generate 65,000 trips per day. Under the applicant's proffer plan, the only access to the site up until Phase 3 will be the Route 28/Nokes Boulevard interchange, currently under design, Severn Way and an extension of Pacific to Waxpool Road, also under design.

In their proffers, the applicant has provided two approaches to mitigating transportation impacts. If a CDA is not approved, the application would proceed under **proffered** conditions that phase the needed road improvements. Staff feels completing Gloucester Parkway from Loudoun County Parkway to Route 28 is needed earlier than Phase 3 of the application. Under their proffer proposal, Gloucester Parkway would have to be built only after zoning permits are issued for 1,200, or 90% of the residential units or after issuing permits for over 2,400,000 square feet or 53% of the nonresidential space.

Where are cars going?

The applicant's traffic study provides a simple breakdown of the *Direction of Approach*. The directional split does not distinguish between individual roads so traffic from the west, for example, may include traffic on Route 7 and Gloucester Parkway. In evaluating the study, staff has questions with some of the assumptions that impact directional split. Staff will be meeting with the applicant to discuss these questions.

Approach	Office	Retail	Residential
From the North	0%	2%	0%
From the South*	40%	18%	50%
From the East	20%	10%	30%
From the West*	40%	70%	20%
Total			

* Assumes the traffic from the south is on Route 28 and from the west is on Route 7

Russell Branch/ Pacific Boulevard

Russell Branch Parkway was defined in the 1995 Countywide Transportation Plan as the Route 7 South Collector and was to connect Pacific Boulevard to Route 659. It was designed as ultimately a 6-lane, controlled access, median divided roadway. Both the Dulles North Area Management Plan in 1985 and the Eastern Loudoun Area Management Plan in 1980 included plans for a southern collector along Route 7. However, the collector in those plans crossed Broad Run south of Loudoun Square.

Summary of Transportation Proffers

PROFFERED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS	Nonresidential	Residential
Phase 1A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct two lanes of Pacific from southern terminus (or from Gloucester if Gloucester is constructed or bonded) to entrance to project. Construct bike trail along Pacific 	Prior to first record plat or site plan and up to 300,000 square feet	Prior to first record plat or site plan and up to 300 units
Phase 1B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct additional two lanes to Pacific up to entrance to the project. Add signals if warranted at all entrances from Pacific to project. 	Prior to 300,001 to 1,100,000 s.f. and up to 270 hotel rooms.	Prior to 301 to 700 units
Phase 2A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 4-lane section of Pacific to Road 6. Provide traffic signals if warranted at all entrances. Construct trail along corresponding extension of Pacific. Install traffic signal at Gloucester and Pacific if warranted. 	Prior to 1,100,001 s.f. to 1,700,000 and 271 to 500 hotel rooms	Prior to 701 to 1,200 units
Phase 2B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 4-lane Pacific to Russell Branch Parkway.* Install traffic signals at all entrances to Pacific if warranted. Construct trail along corresponding section of Pacific. Install traffic signal at Gloucester and Pacific if warranted. 	Prior to 1,700,001 s.f. to 2,400,000 s.f. and 501 to 720 hotel rooms	Prior to 1,201 units
Phase 3 Construct 4-lane Gloucester from Pacific to Loudoun County Parkway.* Install traffic signal at Gloucester and Pacific if warranted	Prior to 2,400,001 or more square feet	Prior to 1,201 or more units.

* Depends on rights-of-way from others.

Alternative road alignments through the Pahlavani property;
How viable is the project without the CDA.

These questions are addressed in the attached letter from the applicant dated June 20, 2007.
The applicant and their engineers met with Mr. Pahlavani to look at alternative routes through the property.

What is the cost of the Rt. 28 buyout?

Staff will bring this information to the Committee meeting.

Status of the Herndon Performing Arts Center.

For several years, the Town of Herndon and the Herndon Foundation for the Cultural Arts have been working to establish a performing arts center. In 2003 the Town Council approved a master plan for a 30,000 square foot facility. The initial attempt to develop the center involved a PPEA that failed when the purchase of a 1.6 acre parcel bogged down and the two participating companies failed to submit detailed proposals. The project was scaled down to a 12,000 square foot, 250-seat theater. The Town was originally expecting to pay for about 60% of the operating cost. A new Town Council saw the project as a lower priority and the project has not moved forward.

Currently the Town is in negotiations with a private developer proposing to include the center in a mixed use project in exchange for about 4 acres of Town land. The developer would build the theater and provide a 300 space public parking structure. The developer is proposing to use tax increment

financing for the parking structure. The discussions are at the initial stage and no formal land development application has been submitted.

Residential density calculation

The residential density is based on the gross area of the PD-TC district, including 258 square feet of floodplain, a total of 66.74 acres. The proposed density of 20.6 units per acre is somewhat higher than the density approved with One Loudoun where the PD-TC residential density is 11.4 units per acre. Commission comments related to the residential component suggested the density be lowered and that the applicant consider age restricted housing. The applicant will speak to the logic behind proposing 1376 units.

Staff opposes the residential proposal for several reasons:

- (1) County policy calls for employment uses on the property and does not support residential development.
- (2) Until better access is provided to the west, this is a bad location for residential development. Accessing residential services and amenities would require traveling on Route 28, Route 7, Nokes Boulevard or Waxpool Road to get to the schools, grocery stores, libraries, etc.
- (3) Until an employment base is established, residential development may work against building employment uses and may be used to justify residential conversion of additional employment land.

Prepare by-right and this proposal (examine floor area, jobs, school costs, other). Decide the future of the adjacent property.

BY-Right Development

The project consists of 256.8 acres of developable area. The current zoning is PD-IP, which permits a light industrial uses at a 0.4 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The building potential is constrained, generally, by the FAR, the lot coverage, parking requirements and height limitations. Taking those factors into account, the by-right scenario would accommodate a maximum of 4,474,500 square feet of non-residential floor area. If the area is to be surface parked, as is typical in Loudoun, the amount of floor area would more likely be in the range of 3,000,000 square feet.

The employment potential of the by-right development would range from 5,000 employees at 3,000,000 square feet to 6,192 employees at maximum FAR. These numbers assume that 49% of the property would develop as office and that office uses would generate 2.2 employees per 1,000 square feet. The remaining 51% of the site would develop as light industrial and employ 1.2 people per 1,000 square feet.

The by-right proposal does not permit residential development so the expected capital facilities impact (per County policy) is 0. There would be no school costs. The table below illustrates several of the key factors/impacts.

Comparison of By-Right and Proposed Development

Categories	Under current zoning	Kincora
Proposed residential units by type	0	MF: 1290 ADU: 86* if required by ordinance Total: 1376
Current units existing and approved (<i>projects of 20 units or greater</i>) in the sub-area		17,757 existing and 35,720 approved (<i>Ashburn sub-area, 2005 Growth Summary</i>)
Student generation.	0	HS: 104 MS: 85 ES: 196 Total: 385
Schools assigned (by Name) Total capacity / student enrollment September 2006 <i>Note: School Board may modify attendance zones.</i>	HS: Broad Run 1681 / 1448 (with trailers) MS: Farmwell 1159 / 1077 ES: Ashburn/Dominion Trail 729 & 776/669 & 693	
Total Capital Impact	\$0	\$24,386,160
Anticipated Capital Facility contribution	\$0	\$22,760,416
Maximum or Proposed Office Development	2,192,500 square feet	3,900,000 square feet
Maximum or Proposed Industrial Development	2,282,000 square feet	0
Maximum or Proposed Retail Development	223,725 square feet (excludes permitted uses such as bank, bakery, fitness center and does not include accessory retail space permitted in warehouses that could total up to 20% of the floor area)	1,014,000 square feet (includes proposed hotels)
Total Non-residential Floor Area	4,474,500 square feet	4,914,000 square feet
Required or Proposed Public Open and Civic Space	Open space: 20% of each lot. Civic space: none	21 acres (location/use undisclosed)
Estimated Number of Employees	6,192	9,129
Vehicle Trips per Day		68,920 average daily trips

Draft Motion

1. I move that the Planning Commission forward ZMAP 2006-0016, Kincora, to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of denial based on the findings included in the May 21, 2007 staff report.
Or
2. I move that the Planning Commission forward ZMAP 2006-0016. Kincora, to committee for further review.
Or
3. I move an alternate motion.

Attachments:

1. Applicant letter dated June 20, 2007 with attachments
 - a. Revised Proffers dated June 20, 2007
 - b. Proposed Alternative Road Alignment Through Pahlavani Property
 - c. Fiscal Analysis
 - d. Response to Zoning Comments
 - e. CDA Petition
2. Revised Plat



HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 1700
MCLEAN, VIRGINIA 22102

TEL 703 • 714 • 7400
FAX 703 • 714 • 7410

JOHN C. MCGRANAHAN, JR.
DIRECT DIAL: 703-714-7464
EMAIL: jmcgranahan@hunton.com

June 20, 2007

FILE NO: 67442.2

BY EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
Loudoun County Planning Commission
1 Harrison Street, S.E.
Third Floor
Leesburg, Virginia 20177-7000

ZMAP 2006-0016 – Kincora

Dear Chairman Klancher:

This letter summarizes the revisions we have made and the work we have done in response to the comments and input we received at and following the Planning Commission public hearing on May 21, 2007.

1. Residential Density.

Several Planning Commissioners have indicated that the residential density is too "urban" at approximately 20 du/ac. The specific direction we received was that 16 du/ac is a more appropriate density for the type of suburban "village" proposed at Kincora. Commissioner Hsu asked us to explain the basis for the proposed 1,376 dwelling units. The Applicant derived that number based on both (i) the economic analysis of the project, including the need to support the \$60 million in regional road improvements for Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard, and (ii) the design analysis of how many units could be provided at an appropriate "village" scale in the residential buildings planned for the project and shown on sheets 30-31 of the Concept Plan. The Applicant also was advised by the Smart Growth Alliance that the residential component needs to be significant in size to achieve the goals of smart growth. The Applicant concluded that 1,376 dwelling units could be provided at the desired scale and would produce an economic return sufficient to support the project.

That said, keynote employment office uses are the focus at Kincora. The residential units are a necessary component of the critical amenities needed to attract Class A office tenants, but the intent is to provide these residential units at a suburban, village scale. Based on input from several Commissioners, the Applicant will reduce the residential density to 16 du/ac, which decreases the total number of dwelling units from 1,376 to 1,068. The 1,068 dwelling units will consist of 981 market rate units, 67 ADUs (6.25%) and 20 "workforce



The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
June 20, 2007
Page 2

housing" units. The 20 workforce housing units will be proffered consistent with the workforce housing proffer approved with the One Loudoun rezoning (ZMAP 2005-0008).

This reduction in dwelling units and the commitment to workforce housing are reflected in the revised Proffer Statement dated June 20, 2007, which is included with this letter as **Attachment 1**.

2. Green Building Initiatives.

Commissioners have expressed an interest in incorporating a proffered commitment to energy efficient office building designs. In response, the Applicant has provided a proffer that construction of the keynote office buildings will incorporate development attributes of the United States Green Building Council's ("USGBC") Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design ("LEED") program. This proffer addresses those categories that determine levels of LEED classification. Whereas this proffer does commit the Applicant to incorporate LEED design principles, it does not require the Applicant to obtain actual LEED certification. The LEED certification process is time consuming and is in a current state of evolution. The Applicant does not want to require an additional layer of review and "certification," which will present a potentially significant obstacle to attracting and constructing the keynote employment uses the County wants on this site. The Applicant is a member of the U.S. Green Building Council, and is committed to constructing energy efficient office buildings, which this proffer ensures.

3. Pacific Boulevard Alignment.

Following the public hearing, the Applicant met with its engineers and the engineers for the Route 28 Partnership to analyze an alternative alignment for Pacific Boulevard, which would avoid Mr. Pahlavani's home. Enclosed as **Attachment 2** is a copy of a sketch that shows such an alternative.

While the alternative alignment avoids Mr. Pahlavani's home, it essentially leaves Mr. Pahlavani with no future use of his property. With the alternative alignment, once the 300 foot setback is applied from Route 7 and the 35 foot setback is applied from the alternative alignment of Pacific, Mr. Pahlavani will be left with no usable area except the continued use of his current home. His property is zoned A-3 currently, but it is planned for keynote office uses like those proposed at Kincora and those that currently exist on Russell Branch Parkway to the west of the Pahlavani property.



The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
June 20, 2007
Page 3

Another drawback to the alternative alignment is it significantly increases the impact on the home of Mr. and Mrs. Hurley, just west of the Pahlavani property.

The original alignment was designed according to VDOT's design speed requirements and was intended to push Pacific Boulevard as close to Route 7 as possible without impacting the historic toll house. That alignment leaves Mr. Pahlavani a useable area that could be rezoned and developed for office uses, similar to the existing office buildings on Russell Branch Parkway to the west. That alignment also leaves the Hurleys' home and surrounding yard areas intact.

The extension of Pacific Boulevard to Russell Branch Parkway is a critical regional road improvement on the Countywide Transportation Plan. It is necessary to accomplish the County's limited access objectives for both Route 7 and Route 28. Regrettably, any alignment is going to impact the Pahlavanis and the Hurleys. The Applicant is willing to work with the alignment the County ultimately determines is better.

Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway, as proposed with Kincora, complete the planned regional road network in this part of the County. With the construction of these critical regional road links, it is anticipated that 65% of Loudoun County residents will be able to access Kincora without using Route 7 or Route 28.

4. Performing Arts Center.

This is the newest facet of the Kincora project. The Applicant has received very helpful input from both Commissioner Volpe and Commissioner Syska. First, the Applicant has added a proffer to donate the two (2) acre site for the performing arts center. The Applicant also has included \$6 million in the proposed community development authority ("CDA") toward the capital costs of constructing the performing arts center, which we believe is the first offer of both land and cash for an arts center in Loudoun County. As mentioned at the Planning Commission public hearing, the Applicant has obtained letters of intent from The Washington Ballet, the Levine School of Music and CityDance Ensemble to locate programs at the performing arts center at Kincora.

At the suggestion of Commissioner Volpe, the Applicant met on June 14, 2007 with the Loudoun Arts Council. The proposed performing arts center at Kincora was well-received by the Council. The Council specifically confirmed that Kincora would be an excellent location for such a center. The Applicant is committed to working with the Council and the County on

The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
June 20, 2007
Page 4

the details of this project and the additional funding needed to make the performing arts center a reality at Kincora.

5. Response to Zoning Administration Referral.

The Applicant received this referral on the Wednesday following the Planning Commission public hearing. The Applicant subsequently met with Ms. Siegfried, Ms. Lohr and Mr. Merrithew on June 7, 2007 to discuss the Zoning Administration comments and the Applicant's intended responses. It was a very productive meeting. On June 14, 2007, the Applicant submitted a point-by-point response to the Zoning Administration referral, a copy of which is enclosed as **Attachment 3**. The Applicant also submitted a revised Concept Plan dated June 13, 2007, primarily in response to several of the Zoning Administration comments.

A significant revision to the Concept Plan was a new "village green" of approximately 40,000 square feet. The village green will be provided between the performing arts center site and the central water feature civic area. The Applicant also has added a pedestrian plaza of at least 10,000 square feet in the PD-TC core adjacent to the village green area. These revisions comply with the requirements for a "town green" in Section 4-808(D) of the Zoning Ordinance.

6. Impact on Route 28 Tax District.

Commissioners have asked the Applicant to address potential adverse impacts on the Route 28 Tax District from the addition of residential uses. First, the Applicant has proffered to pre-pay the Route 28 taxes that would have become due for those areas that become residential and no longer taxable, in accordance with the Board of Supervisors accepted buy-out formula. Secondly, the Applicant has submitted a fiscal impact study that compared Route 28 tax revenues anticipated from by-right development under the existing PD-IP zoning with the Route 28 tax revenues anticipated from Kincora. With this rezoning, Kincora is expected to generate \$22 million toward the Route 28 Tax District over the next 15 years, compared to \$6 million if developed by-right – and the \$6 million assumes PD-IP uses locate on the property, something that has yet to occur in the more than 30 years the property has been zoned PD-IP. A copy of the Applicant's Fiscal Impact Analysis is enclosed as **Attachment 4**.

Finally, the Applicant is proffering to dedicate the right-of-way for the Route 28/Nokes Boulevard interchange, which has an appraised value of \$13.5 million. This dedication will

The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
June 20, 2007
Page 5

save the Route 28 Tax District the cost of having to acquire right-of-way that is necessary to permit the construction of this interchange, which is scheduled to begin this Fall.

7. The CDA.

Commissioners have asked about the impacts if the Board of Supervisors does not create the CDA. The Applicant has structured the rezoning application so it works whether or not the Board creates the CDA. The Applicant strongly prefers creation of the CDA. It is the best and only means of completing the critical road connections for Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard in the foreseeable future. Copies of the Applicant's CDA proposal and the draft CDA Petition, which are being reviewed by the County budget and finance staff, are enclosed as **Attachment 5**. If the CDA is created, the critical regional road infrastructure will be completed in approximately 3 years and will be in place at the beginning of the development of the uses at Kincora.

If the CDA is not created, the Kincora project will build-out just like all other rezoned projects in Loudoun County. The roads will be built as the buildings are developed. Kincora has the advantage that it will be located at a new interchange on Route 28, which will support development of Phase 1 of Kincora as proposed. Kincora will also have the connection of Pacific Boulevard to the south for access. The challenge is that both the Pacific Boulevard and the Gloucester Parkway extensions to the north and west respectively, are extremely expensive. Given the magnitude of the expense and since they are not necessary for Kincora site traffic in Phase 1, they cannot be provided up front under the non-CDA scenario. The less expensive Pacific Boulevard extension can and will be provided in Phase 2. The Gloucester Parkway extension, which is estimated to cost \$32 million, will not be provided until Phase 3 under the non-CDA scenario.

It is important to keep in mind that with approval of the rezoning, these critical regional roads will be built, even under the non-CDA scenario. In contrast, a by-right development under PD-IP could not be required to construct these expensive bridge crossings, the need for which is substantially generated by regional traffic demands.

8. Distinguish Kincora from Other "Town Centers."

Commissioners have asked us to distinguish Kincora from other "Town Centers." First, as explained at the public hearing, Kincora is not at "town center" as typically defined. The typical town center has a core of taller buildings that are surrounded by a town center fringe of

The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
June 20, 2007
Page 6

less intense uses. In response to the recommendations of the Revised General Plan, Kincora has planned its most intense keynote office buildings in a linear pattern along Route 28. The Applicant has incorporated a smaller scale "village center" with a mix of retail, office and residential uses between the keynote employment corridor and the proffered 167-acre park along Broad Run. The intensity of this village center is significantly less than the scale of a project like the Reston Town Center. By comparison, Kincora proposes a 66.7-acre village center consisting of 1,068 dwelling units and 1.77 million square feet of nonresidential uses, while the Reston Town Center is 40 acres consisting of 1,750 dwelling units and 3.65 million square feet of nonresidential uses. The Kincora village center is intended to be an amenity that will attract the office users.

The PD-TC zoning district is being requested because it is the only district in the Zoning Ordinance that permits the mix of amenity uses Kincora needs to create the sense of place that will attract the desired keynote employment uses.

Finally, Kincora is a unique location. It is separated from the Dulles Town Center by Route 28. Likewise, it is separated from One Loudoun by Broad Run and its substantial floodplain areas. These significant man-made and natural barriers will keep these three communities distinct. Yet, with the construction of Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway, these communities will have convenient access to one another without having to travel on Route 7 or Route 28.

9. By-right v. Rezoning.

Commissioners have asked us to compare the requested rezoning to what could be developed by-right under the existing PD-IP. It is important to note that Staff's characterization that the property could be developed by-right for 4 million square feet of office is misleading. Office would require special exception approval under PD-IP. Likely by-right uses would be flex-industrial and warehouse uses like those that currently exist in areas south of the property. Such uses would likely develop not at a .4 FAR, but at a .2 FAR.

There are several disadvantages to leaving the property zoned PD-IP. First, PD-IP will not likely achieve the Revised General Plan recommendation for keynote office. Second, the property has remained vacant for decades zoned PD-IP – a telling and unacceptable underutilization of a key property in the Route 28 Tax District. This prominent site should feature the keynote employment uses proposed with Kincora. Third, by-right development will not support and legally cannot be required to construct the Gloucester Parkway and Pacific



The Honorable Robert J. Klancher, Chairman
June 20, 2007
Page 7

Boulevard crossings of Broad Run. Fourth, the taxes paid to the County generally and to the Route 28 Tax District will be at a minimum if the property remains vacant with PD-IP zoning. They will increase with by-right development if and when it occurs, but they increase significantly with the economic development opportunities provided by the Kincora rezoning. As analyzed during the projected 15-year construction period of Kincora (2007-2022), the net fiscal advantage to the County is estimated at \$202 million for Kincora, as opposed to \$25 million if the property is developed with by-right PD-IP uses.

The County's vision for the Route 28 corridor and specifically for this prominent site will be accomplished with the proposed Kincora rezoning, not with continued PD-IP zoning..

If you or your fellow Commissioners have questions, please call or we will be available to respond further at your June 25th worksession.

With best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John".

John C. McGranahan, Jr.

Enclosures

cc: Members, Loudoun County Planning Commission
Mr. John Merrithew
Mr. Daniel P. Coughlan
Mr. Michael W. Scott